

27 JUL 1965

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

FROM

: Mr.

25X1A9A

SUBJECT

: Comments on the Army War College Program  
1964/65 Course

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS:

The US Army War College Course usually runs from the middle of August to the middle of June the following year. It is given at Carlisle Barracks, Carlisle, Pa., about 110 miles from Washington. The student body, normally, consists of about 200 personnel. The minimum rank is Lt. Col. or the equivalent, and in my class consisted of 165 Army officers; 16 Air Force officers; 16 Navy/Marine Corps officers; and 8 civilians, (2 State; 2 DAC; 1 USIA; 1 AID; 1 NSA; and myself).

The facilities at Carlisle Barracks are crowded but more than satisfactory. During my stay all student families had housing on the post. Those who elected to leave their families in Washington, as in my case, lived in rather sad but adequate BOQs. The post has an Officers Club, golf course, hospital, commissary, PX, etc. and all the other conveniences of military post living. A new construction program is underway which will replace the present academic facilities, including auditorium, classrooms, etc., as well as provide new BOQs, all air-conditioned, which the present facilities are not. No changes in other housing facilities are planned. Throughout my stay at Carlisle, I kept contact with and received support from the Registrar's Office in the Office of Training. The assistance rendered by that group was of a consistently high order.

NATURE OF CURRICULUM:

The methodology at the Army War College broadly consists of four parts: daily lectures by distinguished authorities in the field of foreign and military affairs; working committees to study and discuss the substance of the program; assigned and collateral readings; and a thesis program. All these elements were related and were organized and administered to complement each other.

25X1

-2-

There are eight courses given during the year. The first four concern the field of international affairs (The World Environment; the No. Atlantic Alliance; the Communist Powers; and the Developing Nations), the next three are concerned with military affairs, and the last, consists of an attempt to synthesize the previous seven by the preparation of a National Strategy for the U.S. The courses vary in length from four to eight weeks. Also included during an appropriate course, usually in October, is a three-day trip to the United Nations.

The above curriculum will continue through the coming academic year, but there are already clear signs that the present hierarchy wishes to downgrade the international affairs subjects in favor of more Army type subjects. This trend was evident during my year and is now a subject of some debate at the higher echelons of the Army. Obviously CIA has a stake in which way this goes since, in my opinion, if greater Army emphasis is given to the course it would have less attraction and value to CIA students.

#### COOPERATIVE PROGRAM/GWU:

As a complement to the War Colleges curricular the Defense Establishment has entered into an agreement with the George Washington University for a cooperative program of study leading to either a B.A. or an M.A., depending on the students academic background. Specific details on this program are available from the Registrar. It is the purpose here merely to comment on the value of this program to a CIA participant.

The military have, as part of their peacetime philosophy, placed considerable emphasis on training and recently on the acquisition of advanced degrees by its most promising officers. To that end they have a very active program of training these officers at mid-career at various Universities throughout the country. Agency officers are usually not that fortunate, therefore, in my view the opportunity to gain an advanced degree in International Affairs during War College Residence, as was the case with me, is a unique opportunity which should be eagerly subscribed by CIA war college participants. Admittedly, there is considerably more effort required, with a consequent reduction of ones "free" time. However, the opportunity to learn in depth about the world of foreign affairs, which CIA was created to deal with, far outweighs any minor personal inconvenience.

In this connection it should be pointed out that the military are seriously considering terminating this program. The reasons are varied and psychologically complex, but in essence it stems from the same thinking which holds for more military

-3-

and less foreign affairs emphasis in the War College curricular. The program has been extended only through academic year 1965/66 and a decision on its future will be made during this period.

VALUE TO THE AGENCY:

The value to the Agency of its personnel participating in the various War College programs seems to me to be apparent and breaks down into at least two major categories, benefits to the Agency directly and benefits derived by the Agency during the future course of the man's career.

In a direct sense CIA benefits in proportion to the caliber of the people we send to these senior defense schools. These people constitute a direct projection of our "image" in an environment that, in my view, still has a distorted picture of that image. To a large extent we are still considered freaks in that lacking intimate and continuous contact with CIA personnel, the military quite naturally accept the image most frequently presented by the popular media. They do not do this willingly, but lacking contact and a competing image, they subconsciously accept that which is prevalent and available. The CIA officer at these schools, in my case there was only one from CIA, must actively and consciously, but adroitly, try to change this so that these military officers, most of whom are destined for high command, recognize that we are not a great deal different from them, and aside from our inability to talk much about what we do, are not such a bad bunch.

Before leaving the subject of image it seems important to point out that our image is also affected by the caliber and performance of CIA guest speakers at the War Colleges. During my year the Agency's performance was generally good but with some low spots. Mr. Lyman Kirkpatrick's talk was considered one of the finest in recent years, bar none. Others ranged from good to poor. In sum, great care should be given to the selection of and preparation by CIA officers who speak at these senior schools.

In a more indirect and long range sense the Agency benefits from an officer who has spent a year studying international and military affairs of the highest order, thus making him a more informed, articulate, and confident participant in that milieu during the balance of his Agency career. His horizons are automatically broadened as are his ability to think and analyze his problems from a much larger base of knowledge of the world and national scene. Additionally, this officer will make a number of valuable acquaintances who can be of considerable

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

-4-

assistance to the Agency when these individuals achieve higher military rank.

CONCLUSION:

Overall it was a great privilege to represent the Agency at the Army War College during the past academic year. In my view, all parties benefited from this experience. I strongly urge that CIA's participation in these schools be continued and if possible increased. There is only one negative note and that concerns the move now afoot to further "militarize" these schools. Many senior military officers feel that teaching other than military subjects erodes the "professionalism" of the military officer and to forstaff this they argue for more military emphasis and less emphasis on foreign affairs. If this trend develops to the point where this thinking effectively changes the curricular of these schools I feel the value of Agency participation would diminish in direct proportion to the amount of military stress placed on the curriculum.



25X1A9A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~